DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 078 123 UD 013 689

AUTHOR	James, Margaret A.
TITLE	The Effect of Reinforcement on the Self-Image and Attitude Toward School of Minority Youngsters. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	California State Univ., Hayward.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Educational Research and Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Regional Research Program.
BUREAU NO	BR-1-I-072
PUB DATE	30 Jun 73
CONTRACT	OEC-9-72-0026
NOTE	27p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Attitudes; *Behavior Change; Changing Attitudes; Educational Attitudes; High School Students; Junior High Schools; Junior High School Students; *Microteaching; *Minority Group Children; Self Concept; Self Esteem; Self Evaluation; Senior High Schools; *Student Attitudes; *Student Teachers

ABSTRACT

This investigation attempted to determine whether pre-service teachers who had been trained through micro-teaching in the skill of using reinforcement could bring about any change in minority youngsters' attitudes about themselves and about school. A panel study was done of twenty-eight pre-service teachers in a team-taught, competency-based program, an extension of a cooperative arrangement between four senior high schools and three junior high schools in Oakland, California and the Teacher Education Department, Secondary, of California State University, Hayward. Fourteen, constituting a group called the "experimental student teachers," were trained during a two-week micro-teaching workshop, during the summer prior to starting the program, in the skill of reinforcement. The remaining fourteen, constituting a group designated as the "control student teachers," did not have this training. All other variables were controlled as much as possible. All student teachers had complete control of one class from the first day in the fall until school closed in June. Each student teacher administered pre and post inventories to the pupils in this class. Mean change scores were computed for each student teacher and a comparison of the two groups indicates that teachers who have been trained to use reinforcement may effect positive changes in their pupils' self-image, but have a negative effect on their pupils' attitude toward school. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 078123

Final Report

Project No. 1-I-072
Contract No. OEC-9-72-0026

The Effect of Reinforcement on the Self-Image and Attitude Toward School of Minority Youngsters

Margaret A. James

California State University, Hayward

Hayward, California

June 30, 1973

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
National Center for Educational Research and Development

UD 013683

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ABSTRACT

This investigation attempted to determine whether pre-service teachers who had been trained through micro-teaching in the skill of using reinforcement could bring about any change in minority youngsters' attitudes about themselves and about school.

A panel study was done of twenty-eight pre-service teachers in a team-taught, competency-based program, an extension of a cooperative arrangement between four senior high schools and three junior high schools in Oakland, California and the Teacher Education Department, Secondary, of California State University, Hayward.

Fourteen, constituting a group called the "experimental student teachers," were trained during a two-week micro-teaching workshop, during the summer prior to starting the program, in the skill of reinforcement. The remaining fourteen, constituting a group designated as the "control student teachers," did not have this training. All other variables were controlled as much as possible. All student teachers had complete control of one class from the first day in the fall until school closed in June. Each student teacher administered pre and post inventories to the pupils in this class.

Mean change scores were computed for each student teacher and a comparison of the two groups indicates that teachers who have been trained to use reinforcement may effect positive changes in their pupils' self-image, but have a negative effect on their pupils' attitude toward school.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Grateful acknowledgment is hereby given to the following persons who contributed to the success of this research:

Dr. Lewie Burnett, Dean, School of Education, California State University, Hayward, for his support and encouragement.

Mrs. Carol Kvam, Supervisor, Student Teaching Center, California State University, Hayward, for her assistance in the Micro-Teaching Workshop.

Professors Phyllis Gross, Robert Whitney, and Marvin Winzenread of CSUH, associates on the team which supervised the math/science majors who participated in the program.

Dr. Marcus Foster, Superintendent of Schools, Oakland, California for permission to conduct the research.

Leo Croce, Harry Reynolds, and Verdese Carter, Regional Associate Superintendents, for permission to use the questionnaires in schools within their jurisdiction.

BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

"Micro-teaching is a teaching situation scaled down in terms of time, number of students, number and specificity of teaching skills focused on, and offering the opportunity for immediate feedback in some form." (James M. Cooper and Dwight W. Allen, "Micro-teaching: History and Present Status," February, 1970. ERIC ED 036 471.)

Micro-teaching, as developed at Stanford University in 1963 (Allen and Fortune in "Micro-teaching: A Description," 1966) and elsewhere, has proved effective in pre-service and in-service teacher education. A recent survey indicates that more than 44 percent of all teacher education programs are using micro-teaching in some form. Charles Silberman, in Crisis in the Classroom, speaks of micro-teaching as a promising practice in the education of teachers.

"Micro-teaching is designed to break down the complex act of teaching into simpler elements. Micro-teaching is designed to change the behavior of people." (James L. Olivera, Micro-Teaching: Medium for Improving Instruction, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1970.)

Micro-teaching can change some behaviors, such as instructional methods, more easily than it can change others. Research on the application of micro-teaching has been conducted at such places as the University of Oregon (Keith Acheson); Far West Regional Laboratory (John Hemphill); University of Massachusetts (Dwight Allen); Southwestern Cooperative Educational Laboratory (Robert T. Reeback); Colorado State University (Al Ivey); and AACTE (Jerry Marrs). Video feedback has been successfully used to effect significant changes in: (a) establishing set; (b) establishing appropriate frames of references; (c) achieving closure; (d) using questions effectively; (e) recognizing and obtaining attending behavior; (f) controlling participation; (g) providing feedback; (h) employing rewards and punishments (reinforcement); and (i) setting a model.

In addition to the basic research being conducted at the Stanford Research and Development Center, the Far West Regional Laboratory in San Francisco, California has progressed in a developmental effort to the point where it has now constructed mini-courses designed to produce desired teacher behaviors. The work has focused on both pre-service and in-service instructional models to identify and define critical teacher skills and behavior patterns while developing and testing a system of teacher education utilizing various products assembled by laboratory personnel. They are studying methods of changing teacher behavior toward minority youngsters.

In addition to the work previously cited, a variety of other studies are underway throughout the country. One need only look at the work in progress at the University of Maryland, the University of Massachusetts, the University of Illinois, the University of Chicago,

and Colorado State College in Greely to be aware of the amount of time, energy, and thought that is going into the further development phases of micro-teaching. While it is obvious that much research and investigation has been done in the area of micro-teaching, like most research efforts, the earlier work has tended to support some hypotheses while at the same time pointing toward other dimensions needing attention.

Cooper and Allen (ERIC ED 036 471, F'70) say that the validity of the teaching skills must be established. "We know that we can train teachers to acquire certain teaching behaviors, but we presently have very little information regarding how these behaviors affect students. Every skill should undergo multivariate analysis to check different achievement and attitude domains in order to understand the nature of a teaching skill with regard to students."

Berliner, also at Stanford (ERIC ED 034 707), says:

> "First among many important research areas is the need for creative exploration of the validity of the skills that have been identified. The measurement of pre and post treatment differences in teaching behavior, even when these changes appear lasting and reliable, in no way indicates whether or not teacher behavior is affecting students. It is not known if increased use of reinforcement techniques by a teacher promotes student participation or achievement, or is causally related to the development of positive attitudes toward school or the subject matter, or is damaging in some way to the learner."

Berliner continues,

> ". . . Furthermore, since skills are defined in terms of behavior observable in the natural environment, teacher use of particular skills can be measured and related to student behavior in school settings. Without this kind of information, it is not known if training teachers in specific teaching skills is an academic exercise or a program having a genuine impact on education."

Don Davies, Deputy Commissioner for Renewal, in the U.S. Office of Education says in the October 1970 issue of American Education, "We need to turn our energies toward improved inservice and preservice training, . . . We should learn to evaluate performance in terms of what pupils learn, not in terms of how teachers have been trained."

The objective of this investigation was to use micro-teaching to train pre-service teachers in the use of reinforcement techniques and measure the effects of this training on the attitude toward school and self-image of minority youngsters.

Having supervised student teachers in San Francisco and Oakland schools for the past several years, it has become apparent to this investigator that two of the problems of the minority pupil are his poor self-image and his negative attitude toward school. It was the hypothesis of this investigator that through micro-teaching we can change student teacher behavior toward minority youngsters and train

them in a skill which will result in a change in attitude on the part of the pupils in their classrooms. This project extended the use of micro-teaching with student teachers in a content-integrated secondary education program, the main focus of which was the acquisition of such skills and techniques as would make the student teachers more effective in inner-city high schools.

PROCEDURES

After examining a number of self-concept and attitude inventories, it was decided that two instruments published by the UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation, Measures of Self-Concept and Attitude Toward School would best meet our needs.

During the spring of 1972 permission was secured from Dr. Marcus Foster, Superintendent of Schools, Oakland, California, to conduct the research. The questionnaires (sample included in appendix) were submitted to the Oakland Public Schools Research Department for approval. Arrangements were completed with Leo Croce, Frank Reynolds, and Verdese Carter, Regional Associate Superintendents to use the following schools: Castlemont High, Oakland Technical, Oakland High, McClymonds High, McChesney Jr. High, Havenscourt Jr. High, and Frick Jr. High.

During the spring also, twenty-eight mathematics or science majors were selected from a pool of qualified applicants to California State University, Hayward, for the Teacher Education Program, Secondary. Fourteen of the selectees were picked at random and designated as the "experimental student teachers" and the remaining fourteen were the "control student teachers."

The fourteen experimental student teachers participated in a micro-teaching workshop in August before the public schools opened. The control student teachers did not have this experience.

Before starting the workshop the students were asked to read Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory, Wallace D. LaBenne and Bert I. Greene. (Pacific Palisades, Ca.: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc., 1969); Encounters with Teaching: A Microteaching Manual, Gregory (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972); and Black Self-Concept Banks and Grambs, eds. (New York: McGraw Hill).

An outline of the workshop is included in the appendix but, in general, mornings were spent in training the participants in skills which are assumed to be effective in changing youngsters' self-concept and attitude toward school and afternoons were spent in developing lessons and materials to use in the micro-teaching sessions.

The opening of the public schools in September found each student teacher assigned to one class per day for the year in either a junior high or a senior high school. Each student teacher, having participated in the orientation for new teachers and the planning sessions previous to the opening of school, was prepared to start his class.

During the second week of school, after attendance had settled, each student teacher administered the Measures of Self-Concept and Attitude Toward School inventories to the pupils in his class (N approximately 800). The two inventories were given during the same period, taking approximately 15-20 minutes each, although no time limit

TABLE 1

SELF IMAGE INVENTORY

EXPERIMENTAL TEACHERS				CONTROL TEACHERS			
Teach.	Pre	Post	Change	Teach.	Pre	Post	Change
1	2.60354	2.79313	.18959	2	2.87807	2.77983	-.09824
5	2.61361	2.86920	.25559	3	Withdrew from program		
8	2.93333	2.76518	-.16815	4	2.87347	2.94565	.07218
9	2.61990	2.76546	.14556	6	2.89359	2.78612	-.10747
11	2.65279	2.76242	.10963	7	2.91529	2.81025	-.10504
12*	2.61266 2.76777	2.68097 2.78510	.06831 .01733	10	2.87193	2.78139	-.09054
13	2.62933	2.81903	.1897	14	2.74755	2.83236	.08481
16	2.60473	2.83781	.23308	15	Data not usable		
18	2.61993	2.77523	.1553	17	3.03604	3.05681	.02077
20	Data not usable			19	2.89365	2.84000	-.05365
21	2.74432	2.72772	-.0166	23	2.77683	2.79433	.0175
22	2.63535	2.87332	.23797	26	Withdrew from program		
24	Withdrew from program			27	Withdrew from program		
25	Withdrew from program			28	Withdrew from program		
*Teacher No. 12 gave inventory to two classes							
Mean			.118097				-.028854
SD			.124907				.078224
SE			.036055				.026057

$t = 3.303382$ $(p < .01)$

TABLE 2

ATTITUDE TOWARD SCHOOL INVENTORY

EXPERIMENTAL TEACHERS				CONTROL TEACHERS			
Teach.	Pre	Post	Change	Teach.	Pre	Post	Change
1	2.50719	2.57058	.06339	2	2.70991	2.62500	−.08491
5	2.52003	2.64807	.12804	3	Withdrew from program		
8	2.58088	2.53846	−.04242	4	2.56124	2.51711	−.04413
9	2.48025	2.41352	−.06673	6	2.70611	2.67582	−.03029
11	2.59546	2.62887	.03341	7	2.64117	2.64807	.0069
12*	2.5179 2.60422	2.56151 2.54920	.04361 −.05502	10	2.72869	2.77645	.04776
13	2.57042	2.44089	−.12953	14	2.41850	2.43815	.01965
16	2.48994	2.49602	.00608	15	Data not usable		
18	2.51054	2.54196	.03142	17	2.69577	2.70642	.01065
20	Data not usable			19	2.58140	2.40402	−.17738
21	2.61429	2.51543	−.09886	23	2.57198	2.60710	.03512
22	2.55914	2.59068	.03154	26	Withdrew from program		
24	Withdrew from program			27	Withdrew from program		
25	Withdrew from program			28	Withdrew from program		
*Teacher No. 12 gave inventory to two classes							
Mean			−.004590				−.025070
SD			.074478				.071049
SE			.021494				.023664

was set. The inventories were machine scored and results are reported in Tables 1 and 2.

During the year, all student teachers were videotaped frequently and supervisors analyzed their tapes with them. Careful attention was paid to helping the experimental student teachers, especially, maintain the skills which had been developed in the micro-teaching workshop. They were encouraged to work with pupils individually, to use interaction analysis to determine how effective they were in classroom discussion, and to become involved with their pupils outside the classroom by sponsoring clubs, taking them on field trips and camping trips, and coaching sports. Careful anecdotal records were kept and frequent individual conferences were held with the student teachers to make certain they were doing all they could to improve their youngsters' attitudes about themselves and school.

The post inventories were administered by all the student teachers to the same pupils and the results are shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Two experimental student teachers and four control student teachers dropped out of the program before completion and their data was not included. In addition, one experimental and one control student teacher presented data which were not usable and they were not included.

The data collected were used to test two hypotheses:

1. There will be no positive change in self-concept in either Group A high school pupils (those who have been with the experimental student teachers) and Group B high school pupils (those who have been with the control student teachers) as determined by a comparison of pre- and post-scores on a Measure of Self-Concept.

2. There will be no positive change in attitude toward school in either Group A high school pupils (those who have been with the experimental student teachers) and Group B high school pupils (those who have been with the control student teachers) as determined by a comparison of pre- and post-scores on a Measure of Attitude Toward School.

RESULTS

Table 1 shows the results of the Self-Image Inventory. Pre- and post-averages, together with change scores for experimental teachers are listed on the left and those for control teachers on the right. The mean change score effected by the experimental teachers was .118097 compared to the mean change scores of the control teachers, minus .028854. SD and SE were computed and it was determined that the difference in the effectiveness of the two groups was significant at the .01 level.

Looking at the table in another way, nine out of eleven experimental student teachers apparently raised their pupils' self-image while only four of the nine control student teachers were able to bring about a positive change in their pupils. Or, negatively, two of the eleven experimental student teachers' mean change scores decreased in contrast to five of the nine control student teachers'.

Thus, the data disprove hypothesis 1, since there was a positive mean change score calculated for Group A high school pupils (those who have been with the experimental student teachers).

Table 2 shows the results of the Attitude Toward School Inventory. Pre- and post-averages, together with change scores for experimental teachers are listed on the left and those for control teachers on the right. The mean change scores of both groups were negative, minus .004590 for the experimental teachers and minus .025070 for the control teachers. SD and SE were computed for each and it was determined on sight that there was no significant difference in the effectiveness of the two groups of student teachers.

Five of the eleven experimental and four of the nine control student teachers seemed to have a negative effect on their pupils' attitude toward school.

Thus, the data prove hypothesis 2, there was no positive change in attitude toward school in either Group A pupils (those who have been with the experimental student teachers) or Group B pupils (those who have been with the control student teachers) as determined by a comparison of pre- and post-scores on a Measure of Attitude Toward School.

CONCLUSIONS

A careful examination of the results leads the investigator to the conclusion that it is not only possible to train student teachers to help minority youngsters feel better about themselves, but that we can evaluate their effectiveness in terms of their pupils' change in attitude.

Although the experimental teachers were the ones who were trained in reinforcement techniques and who were observed carefully throughout the year to make sure that they were using them, no effort was made to withhold suggestions or support from the control group of teachers, many of whom were teaching in the same schools. Many pupils benefited from their association with one of our student teachers.

It is difficult, too, to estimate the amount of influence a student teacher who sees a youngster for one period a day plus some extra-instructional activities can have on the self-perception of that youngster who is subjected to so many other influences at school, in his home, and on the street.

It was theorized that the experimental student teachers might have more holding power because of their concern for individuals and their ability to relate to their pupils on a personal basis. Both groups of student teachers kept logs of the pupils who withdrew from their classes and their reasons for leaving. These data were compiled, but not included in this report because there did not seem to be any correlation.

The negative results of both experimental and control teachers on their pupils' attitude toward school is discouraging. One might suspect that this attitude would be more subject to influence than self-perception. Also, one might reason that the teacher's employment of reinforcement techniques would encompass both (i.e. the teacher praised my work, so I feel better about myself).

One possible reason for the negative change scores on the Attitude Toward School Inventory might be because the pupils, for the most part, took them just after school had resumed in the fall and they may have been reluctant to see their vacation come to an end and just at the time of final examinations and grading when many of them might have been feeling a dislike for school.

In conclusion, this was a small study and much more research is needed before any definite statements can be made about our ability to measure changes in attitude on the part of pupils which are caused by student teachers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alford, David J. "Achievement and Attitude," The Science Teacher. (April, 1972), 36-38.

Allen, Dwight, and J. Fortune. "Micro-teaching: A Description." Palo Alto: Stanford University, 1966.

Banks, James A., and Jean D. Grambs (eds.). Black Self-Concept. New York: McGraw Hill, 1972.

Berliner, David. "Microteaching and Teacher Training." Palo Alto: Stanford University, ERIC ED 034 707.

Coleman, James S., et. al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Cooper, James M., and Dwight W. Allen. "Micro-teaching: History and Present Status." Palo Alto: Stanford University, ERIC ED 036 471, February, 1970.

"Critique for Reinforcement." Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program Manual of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory, 104 East Independence Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64106.

Davies, Don. "The Teacher Numbers Game," American Education (October, 1970), 7-8.

Gregory, Thomas. Encounters with Teaching: A Microteaching Manual. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

LaBenne, Wallace D., and Bert I. Greene. Educational Implications of Self-Concept Theory. Pacific Palisades, California: Goodyear Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.

Measures of Self-Concept and Attitude Toward School. Los Angeles: Instructional Objectives Exchange, UCLA Center for the Study of Evaluation. n.d.

Olivera, James L. Micro-Teaching: Medium for Improving Instruction. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

Rosenthal, Robert, and Lenore Jacobson. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Silberman, Charles. Crisis in the Classroom. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

APPENDIX

Micro-Teaching Laboratory

Trainees: N = 14
Professors: 2
High School Pupils: 8 high school pupils, 4 hr/day for 6 days
Technicians: 2
Dates: August 14-25

Modules: 45 min. per trainee
7 trainees/station (1 professor, 1 technician, and 4 high school pupils at each station)
4 hr/day for 6 days

Module:
T - 5 min.
C_1 - 10 "
15-min. break
RT - 5 min.
C_2 - 10 "

T - initial micro-teaching lesson with a group of four high school pupils
C_1 - first critique session (professor, student teacher, and four pupils)
RT - re-teach same lesson to a different group of four high school pupils
C_2 - second critique session (professor, student teacher, and four pupils)

The high school pupils volunteered to participate in the workshop. They were paid $1.60 an hour and transportation from Oakland to the University. Four were boys and four, girls. They were in the 10th through 12th grades; had variable reading achievement, and included Blacks and Chicanos. They had applied to the National Youth Corps in Oakland for summer employment. The pupils were very dependable and seemed to enjoy the work. Our student teachers, many of whom had not had such a relationship with minority youngsters before, soon felt at ease with them and appreciated the suggestions they gave them.

Micro-Teaching Workshop

Monday, August 14, 1972

Greetings
Explanation of micro-teaching
Answer questions
Pass micro-teaching schedules and have students sign up
Administer OPI and MTAI inventories
Show film, "Marked for Failure"
Discuss reasons for negative self-image

Afternoon spent preparing lessons and materials

Tuesday, August 15, 1972

Film from Stanford (Models of Non-Verbal Communication, Questionning, and Reinforcement)
Discuss self-concept
Discuss research on effect of self-concept on achievement
"Achievement and Attitude" by David J. Alford, The Science Teacher, April, 1972, pp. 36-38.
"Towards More Open and Humane Education: The Data Base" by Robert E. Leeper, mimeographed copy.
The Coleman Report
Discuss self-fulfilling prophecy
Pygmalion in the Classroom
Excerpts (mimeographed) from a speech made by William Glasser on our campus

Afternoon spent preparing lessons and materials

Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday - Micro-teaching sessions, two held simultaneously with eight senior and junior high school pupils from Oakland participating. After each session, the pupils and instructors suggested ways the student teacher might have improved the lesson, after which the student teacher repeated the lesson to another group of pupils who also critiqued it. All critique sessions were taped, so the student teacher could refer to the suggestions again if necessary.

Monday, August 21, 1973

All tapes were shown to the entire group of experimental student teachers who filled out CRITIQUE FOR REINFORCEMENT forms for their colleagues. (The sample form appears in the appendix and was copied from the Cooperative Urban Teacher Education Program Manual of the Mid-continent Regional Educational Laboratory.)

Afternoon spent preparing lessons and materials

Tuesday, August 22, 1973
Discussion of assigned texts
Games and simulation using reinforcement techniques

Afternoon spent preparing lessons and materials

Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday - Micro-teaching sessions similar to last week.

On Friday, our student teachers entertained the pupils by taking them on a tour of the campus and to the pool and tennis courts. We taped a final session with the pupils answering our question, "What do teachers do that you like?" and "What do teachers do that you wish they wouldn't?" We re-showed this and selected critique tapes during the year.

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Department of Teacher Education

Project 1-I-072
Dr. James

CRITIQUE FOR REINFORCEMENT

IDENTIFICATION: Student teacher _____ Subject _____

Teach _____ Reteach _____ Observer _____

POSITIVE NONVERBAL: THE TEACHER ENCOURAGED the pupil's comments and answers by:

Smiling _____

Nodding his (her) head _____

Writing pupil's answer on board _____

Moving toward pupil _____

Eye contact _____

Others _____

_____

POSITIVE VERBAL: THE TEACHER REWARDED the pupil's correct answers or good questions by:

Fine _____

Excellent _____

Good _____

Others _____

_____

Positive qualified (give examples) _____

_____

NEGATIVE REINFORCEMENT: THE TEACHER RESPONDED to the pupil by:

No _____

Wrong _____

Frowning _____

Scowling _____

Others _____

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT (list on back)

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY HAYWARD
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

STUDENT INVENTORY I

Secondary Level

Directions

Please show whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements in this booklet by marking the appropriate bubble on the exam card with the special pencil.

A = Strongly Agree, B = Agree, C = Disagree,
D = Strongly Disagree, E = Leave Blank

For example:

I want to be a movie star. A B C D E

I like chocolate cake. A B C D E

Do not fill in more than one bubble for any statement.

There are no right or wrong answers, so respond to each statement as honestly as you can.

Do not write your name on the exam card. Do not write on the booklet.

1. I like to meet new people.
2. I can disagree with my family.
3. Schoolwork is fairly easy for me.
4. I am satisfied to be just what I am.

5. I ought to get along better with other people.
6. My family thinks I don't act as I should.
7. I usually like my teachers.
8. I am a cheerful person.

9. People often pick on me.
10. I do my share of work at home.
11. I often feel unset in school.
12. I often let other people have their way.

13. Most people have fewer friends than I do.
14. No one pays much attention to me at home.
15. I can get good grades if I want to.
16. I can be trusted.

17. I am easy to like.
18. There are times when I would like to leave home.
19. I forget most of what I learn.
20. I am popular with kids my own age.

21. I am popular with girls.

22. My family is glad when I do things with them.

23. I often volunteer in school.

24. I am a happy person.

25. I am lonely very often.

26. My family respects my ideas.

27. I am a good student.

28. I often do things that I'm sorry for later.

29. Older kids do not like me.

30. I behave badly at home.

31. I often get discouraged in school.

32. I wish I were younger.

33. I am always friendly toward other people.

34. I usually treat my family as well as I should.

35. My teacher makes me feel I am not good enough.

36. I always like being the way I am.

37. Most people are much better liked than I am.

38. I cause trouble to my family.

39. I am slow in finishing my school work.

40. I am often unhappy.

41. I am popular with boys.

42. I know what is expected of me at home.

43. I can give a good report in front of the class.

44. I am not as nice looking as most people.

45. I don't have many friends.

46. I sometimes argue with my family.

47. I am proud of my school work.

48. If I have something to say, I usually say it.

49. I am among the last to be chosen for teams.

50. I feel that my family always trusts me.

CARD # 2

1. I am a good reader.

2. I don't worry much.

3. It is hard for me to make friends.

4. My family would help me in any kind of trouble.

5. I am not doing as well in school as I would like to.

6. I have a lot of self control.

7. Friends usually follow my ideas.

8. My family understands me.

9. I find it hard to talk in front of the class.

10. I often feel ashamed of myself.

11. I wish I had more close friends.
12. My family oftens expects too much of me.
13. I am good in my school work.
14. I am a good person.

15. Sometimes I am hard to be friendly with.
16. I get upset easily at home.
17. I like to be called on in class.
18. I wish I were a different person.

19. I am fun to be with.
20. I am an important person to my family.
21. My classmates think I am a good student.
22. I am sure of myself.

23. Often I don't like to be with other children.
24. My family and I have a lot of fun together.
25. I would like to drop out of school.
26. I can always take care of myself.

27. I would rather be with kids younger than me.
28. My family usually considers my feelings.
29. I can disagree with my teacher.
30. I can't be depended on.

C LIFORNIA ST TE UNIVERSITY HAYWARD
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION

STUDENT INVENTORY II

Secondary Level

Directions

Please show whether you agree or disagree with each of the statements in this booklet by marking the appropriate bubble on the exam card with the special pencil.

A = Strongly, B = Agree, C = Disagree,

D = Strongly Disagree, E = Leave Blank

For example:

1. My classes are too easy.

If you disagree with the statement you should mark the bubble on the exam card as follows:

1.

Do not mark more than one bubble for any statement.

There are no right or wrong answers, so respond to each statement as honestly as you can.

Do not write your name on the exam card. Do not write on the booklet.

1. My teachers rarely explain to me why I deserve the grades I earn on assignments and tests.
2. I do my best in school.
3. My teachers are interested in the things I do outside of school.
4. Each morning I look forward to coming to school.
5. My school has too many rules.
6. My teachers allow students some choice in what they study in class.
7. I often feel rushed and nervous at school
8. My teachers give assignments that are too difficult.
9. Students here aren't very friendly.
10. My teachers try to make their subjects interesting to me.
11. I hate having to do homework.
12. My teachers are interested in what I have to say.
13. When I'm at school, I'm usually unhappy.
14. This school is run like a prison.
15. In most of my classes, individual students can choose assignments which are interesting to them.
16. If I did something wrong at school, I know I would get a second chance.
17. My teachers give assignments that are just busy-work.
18. I enjoy working on class projects with other students.
19. My teachers really like their subjects.
20. I would rather learn a new sport than play one I already know.
21. My teachers are personally concerned about me.
22. School depresses me.
23. Whenever I'm called to one of the offices at school, I feel upset.
24. I think there is too much pressure in school.
25. My teachers give me too much work.
26. School is a good place for making friends.
27. My teachers are boring.

28. I like the challenge of a difficult assignment.
29. My teachers don't try to understand young people.
30. I stay home from school whenever I can.
31. My classes are too big.
32. I'm very interested in what goes on at this school.
33. My teachers explain assignments clearly.
34. In school I have to memorize too many facts.
35. The main reason for going to school is to learn.
36. If I had a serious problem, I don't know one teacher in my school I could go to.
37. Students have enough voice in determining how this school is run.
38. My teachers have encouraged me to think for myself.
39. My teachers have been fair to me.
40. I usually don't get involved in many school activities.
41. My teachers won't give me any idea of what will be on their tests.
42. I really like most of the kids at this school.
43. My teachers don't allow me to be creative.
44. Teachers recognize my right to a different opinion.
45. I get tired of listening to my teachers talk all the time.
46. I attend many school events.
47. I like to talk to my teachers after class.
48. I think my teachers are too old-fashioned.
49. I really feel I'm part of my school.
50. My teachers frequently show a lack of preparation.

CARD # 2

1. It is difficult for a new student to find friends here.
2. I have a good relationship with most of my teachers.
3. My favorite classes are those in which I learn the most.
4. I would like to go to school all year long.
5. Each September I look forward to the beginning of school.

6. Our school is so large, I often feel lost in the crowd.

7. I usually get the grade I deserve in a class.

8. My teachers are friendly toward the students.

9. I try to do good work in my class.

10. My teachers still respect me as a person even when I've done poorly on my school work.

11. I like school better than my friends do.

12. There's no privacy at school.

13. My teachers let me know what is expected of me.

14. I enjoy the social life here.

15. My teachers grade me fairly.

16. There are many closed groups of students here.

17. My teachers like working with young people.

18. I often buy books with my own money.

19. My teachers are too concerned with discipline.

20. I liked school better when I was in elementary school than I do now.

21. At school, other people really care about me.

22. If I thought I could win, I'd like to run for an elected student body office.

23. My teachers will discuss grade changes with me.

24. My teachers just don't care about students if they're not going to college.

25. I do more school work than just what is assigned.

26. Teachers at my school cannot control their classes.

27. My teachers give me individual help willingly.

28. Lunch time at school is not fun.

29. My teachers are often impatient.

30. If I had the choice, I wouldn't go to school at all.

31. My teachers have "pets".

32. My teachers often waste too much time explaining things.

33. I follow the school rules.